

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 15, 1962

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: All-Network TV Interview

I have no very profound thoughts about this interview, except that I think it should focus on the substance rather than the method of policy. I say this because, according to the plans Pierre and I discussed with NBC yesterday, you will do an hour show in late January on the institution of the Presidency, in which you would presumably focus on the methods of the office.

What do people want to hear you talk about? My guess is that they want to know what progress we are making toward certain cherished objectives -- a peaceful world, a militarily strong America, and an America growing in economic opportunity and civil freedom.

1. A peaceful world: I think you can honestly say that the world has made strides toward peace in the last two years. In order not to sound self-serving, you may wish to talk about it in terms of the tendencies of history and the resolution of the free peoples; but it will be difficult not to cite the Cuban episode as a milestone in progress toward peace. What Cuba showed is that a combination of firmness and restraint -- a precise adjustment of force to the character of the threat -- can both deter our adversary from aggressive acts and maintain the confidence of the other free nations in American leadership. Cuba therefore introduces a new phase of flexibility into world affairs.

However, it would be an error to suppose that we are on the verge of the millennium. The problems of our age are too deeply rooted to yield to overnight solutions. In particular, a profound gap remains

between ourselves and the Communists -- a gap based on a fundamental difference in the view of the future. The Communists view the future as moving inexorably along predestined lines to a predestined conclusion -- an entirely Communist world. We may believe that the invention of nuclear weapons has compelled Khrushchev to abandon the older Communist idea that such a world may be attained by military means. But we would be wrong to suppose that Khrushchev has abandoned the idea of a unitary, monolithic world based on a single infallible body of doctrine.

For our part, we stand for the world of diversity and choice -- the pluralistic world, composed of a diversity of economic systems, political creeds and religious faiths, united by a common respect for the rights of others and a common loyalty to the world community. So far as one can tell, the currents of history are flowing in the direction of the pluralistic world rather than the monolithic world. This is spectacularly true within the Communist world itself, where the forces of diversity have broken the bonds both of Communist ideology and Communist discipline. What we must hope is that the sustained demonstration of the strength and growth of the free nations will finally persuade the Communists that the Marxist prophecy of a unitary world is wrong, and will lead them to accept a rôle as one element in a richly diversified world.

Even if there were no Communist states, however, there still would be grave problems in our world -- most of all, the widening gap between the rich nations and the poor nations. During the decade of the 1950s, the per capita income of the less developed nations increased by \$13 -- as against \$385 in the developed nations. Nor was this discrepancy due just to population growth eating up output in the underdeveloped world. The actual income growth rate in the less developed world was 2.8 percent -- as against 4 percent in the developed world. In 1960, the GNP of the developed world was \$905 billion -- as against \$192 billion in the underdeveloped world (the comparable figures in 1950 were \$604 billion to \$146 billion). The developed world includes about 1 billion people as against 2.1 billion in the underdeveloped world. FDR talked about one-third of a nation as being ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished. Today

3.

two-thirds of the world is ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished -- and, if the gap continues to widen, it can have only the most ominous consequences for the rich nations. Hence our movement toward a peaceful world requires us and the other developed countries to do what we can to assist the processes of democratic development among the emerging nations -- Alliance for Progress, etc.

Bill Jordan's memorandum contains necessary detail on our foreign policy in the last two years.

2. A militarily strong America: this might be an occasion to explain again the importance of building the conventional military power of the free nations in order to provide a range of choices between capitulation and nuclear catastrophe. The Cuban affair demonstrates again the importance of conventional strength. You might also wish to emphasize that we are building military power, not as an end in itself, but as a means toward world stabilization -- and that our hope is that the Communist states will join with us as rapidly as possible in moving toward world disarmament under reliable international safeguards.

3. A vital America -- economically and spiritually: in order to support our international and security policies, we must have an America continually growing in economic opportunity and in civil freedom.

On the economic side, our progress, though cheering, is still inadequate. We must accelerate our rate of growth. This means a policy of stimulating the economy, bringing about a full employment of our men and machines and expanding economic opportunity for all. This objective should be one primary standard by which we judge tax policy, monetary policy, resources policy, labor-management relations, government-business relations, etc.

We must also begin to invest the proceeds of growth in the long-run future of the nation. Our obligation is to be strong, not just for the next year, but for the next century. This means a policy of invest-

ment in the education, the health and the welfare of our people. In purely economic terms, two-thirds of our past economic growth has been due to increases in productivity -- and increases in productivity depend directly on the size of the national investment in education and research.

Investment in human resources is not something which can be postponed to a more tranquil future; it is an integral part of a policy of national strength. Our destiny as a nation depends more than anything else on the capacity of succeeding generations to meet the harsh challenges of the years to come. As the wealthiest nation known to human history, we are surely in a position to provide our children with the best possible education, the best possible medical care and the widest possible opportunity -- and thus to equip them as well as we can for the tests which lie ahead.

So far as equality of opportunity is concerned, we have made tremendous progress in the last generation. Never in our history have our Negro fellow-citizens enjoyed the range of opportunity they enjoy today. But we still have farther to go if we are to fulfill the pledges of the Declaration of Independence for all our people. This is a basic test of our capacity as a nation to live up to our own vision of a democratic and free society. And, while we should strive for equality of opportunity for its own sake, our performance here is also a crucially important factor in the attitude toward us of the impoverished two-thirds of the world.

AS
Arthur Schlesinger, jr.